APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/922,209	08/03/2001	John David West Brothers	9339/34809	7950

24728   7590   11/30/2007
MORRIS MANNING MARTIN LLP
3343 PEACHTREE ROAD, NE
1600 ATLANTA FINANCIAL CENTER
ATLANTA, GA 30326

EXAMINER
HOSSAIN, TANIM M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2145	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
11/30/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/922,209	BROTHERS, JOHN DAVID WEST
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tanim Hossain	2145	

-- *The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address* --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>20 September 2007</u>.

2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b) ☒ This action is non-final.

3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) ☒ Claim(s) <u>1-60</u> is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>1-8,10-31 and 39-60</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) ☒ Claim(s) <u>9, 32-38</u> is/are rejected.

7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a) ☐ All   b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:

      1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail. Date. _____.

5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 9 and 32-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Harada (U.S. 2007/0124471) in view of Smith (U.S. 6,529,956).

As per claim 9, Harada teaches a method comprising the steps of receiving a signal at a

web server requesting a web page document from a WAD (Figure 5, Abstract); retrieving data

for the web page document including a URL of one or more resources referenced in the web

page document (paragraph 0029, 0036); retrieving resource access right data for the URL (0036,

0040-0041); generating hash and/or encrypted data to generate secure access right data (0036,

0040-0041); generating the web page document including a secure URL that can be used to

generate a request for the one or more resources (Figure 5, 0036, 0040-0041); transmitting the

web page document including the secure URL to the WAD (0040-0041); and wherein the steps

are performed at the web server in response to the received signal from the WAD (0040-0041).

Though suggested, Harada does not specifically teach that the received signal includes an IP

address of the WAD, that the retrieval of the access right data uses the IP address of the WAD

and/or a user name and password combination established through a login, and that a secure

URL is generated through the specific use of the WAD IP address or the login procedure. Smith

teaches that the received signal includes an IP address of the WAD (column 11, lines 62-65;

column 13, lines 60-65; column 15, lines 57-62; column 16, lines 15-25); retrieving resource

access right data using the IP address of the WAD and/or user name and password established

through a login procedure (column 11, lines 62-65; column 13, lines 60-65; column 15, lines 57-

62; column 16, lines 15-25); and combining the secure resource access right data with the

respective URL to generate a secure URL (2; 25-40, 11; 39-54, 17; 20-27). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include the specific

embodiment of retrieving access right data using a received IP address or login procedure, and

creating a secure URL through this data, as taught by Smith, into the user-specific secure web

data access system of Harada. The motivation for doing so lies in the fact that using a secure

URL (as defined by Smith) would enable further security and user-specificity, which would

render the Harada invention more efficient and safe. Further, the concept of secure URLs in a

web-accessing system is very well known in the art, and therefore this procedure of creating

secure URLs would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art. Both inventions are

from the same field of endeavor, namely the efficient retrieval of data from a web server.

As per claim 32, Harada-Smith teaches a method comprising the steps of: receiving a

signal at web server requesting access to a resource, the request signal including a URL, secured

resource access right data, and an IP address of a WAD requesting access to the resource, and

hash data, wherein the request signal was generated from a web page document requested by the

WAD that was generated by the web server and contains a secure URL combining hash data,

URL, and secured resource access right data (Harada: Figure 5, 0036, 0040-0041; Smith: 2; 25-

40, 11; 39-54, 17; 20-27); verifying whether key data is valid based on data corresponding to the

key data in a secure content key database (Smith: 13; 60-65); if the key data is verified as valid

in step (b), generating hash data based on at least the IP address, URL, and the key data (Smith:

15; 57-62, 16; 15-25); verifying that the hash data generated in step (c) matches the hash data

included in the request signal received in the step (a) (Smith: 15; 30-40); and wherein the steps

are performed at the web server in response to the received signal from the WAD (Harada:

Figure 5, 0036, 0040-0041).

As per claim 33, Harada-Smith teaches the method as claimed in claim 32, further

comprising the steps of: terminating the request signal if the verifying of the step (d) indicates

that the hash data generated in the step (c) does not match the hash data included in the request

signal received in the step (a) (Smith: 13; 60-65).

As per claim 34, Harada-Smith teaches the method as claimed in claim 33, further

comprising the steps of: determining whether access to a resource is to be provided to a device

identified by the IP address, based on the resource access right data included in the request signal

(Smith: 15; 57-62, 16; 15-25); and providing access to the resource to a device identified by the

IP address if the determining of the step (f) indicates that access to the resource is to be provided

(Smith: 15; 57-62, 16; 15-25).

As per claim 35, Harada-Smith teaches the method as claimed in claim 34, further

comprising the steps of: retrieving resource access right data from a database, the determining of

step (f) based further on whether the IP address of the request signal is authorized to access the

resource indicated by the URL of the request signal, based on the retrieved resource access right

data (Smith: 13; 60-65).

As per claim 36, Harada-Smith teaches the method as claimed in claim 32, wherein the request signal received in step (a) includes key index data, the method further comprising the step of: retrieving the key data from the secure content key database using key index data (Smith: 13; 32-46).

As per claims 37 and 38, Harada-Smith teaches the method as claimed in claim 32, but does not specifically teach time-to-live considerations in dealing with the validity of key data. Official notice is taken that the consideration of time-based data in creating and using keys is well known in the art of key generation and manipulation (Please see paragraph 373 of U.S. 2004/0170176, as an example). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include time-to-live considerations in the system of Smith-Harada, to allow for situations where sessions may be timed out, so that security is maintained.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on September 20, 2007 have fully been considered, and are respectfully traversed by the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tanim Hossain whose telephone number is 571/272-3881. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on 571/272-3933. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Tanim Hossain
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2145

/Jason D Cardone/
Supervisory Patent Examiner,
Art Unit 2145